



JEFFERSON PARK GYM PROJECT
PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #6
Thursday, December 19, 2002 7:00-8:55 p.m.
Jefferson Community Center

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

PAT Members Present:

Kevin Lee	Liz Walsh-Boyd
George Robertson	Randy Smith
Jean Crowhorn	Greg Kogita
Bill Reubel	Kellye Hilde
Otis Campbell	

PAT Members Absent:
Antelmo Reyes Mondragon
Dave Budd

Others Present:

Debra Casault	Michael Richmond
Ken Bounds	Erin Devoto
Mira Latoszek	Don Bullard
Rex Bond	Cheryl Fraser
Ed Hiro	Jim Crowhorn
Mike Carney	Angela Lee
Betty Lau	Chris Morningstar
Art Wong	Neil Wilson
Will Lew	Willie Weir
Warren Yee	Robert Hinrix
And others who did not sign in...	

Meeting Facilitator: Don Bullard

Notes of Previous Meeting: Notes from the 11/14/02 meeting were approved without changes.

Welcome: Don Bullard opened the meeting. The PAT sign-in sheet was circulated. Don briefly review the objectives of the meeting and the agenda was verified.

Comments from Visitors: Robert Hinrix talked about a proposal to use some of the Jefferson Park ProParks funding to relocated and reconstruct the fence at the north end of the driving range. He presented a letter from the Jefferson Park Alliance to that effect. He explained that moving the fence would enhance safety, reduce operating costs for the golf operations, and increase general park space – allowing implementation of part of the site plan.

He also suggested that the ProParks money be loaned to Seattle Golf and later repaid.

Neil Wilson said he would like to hold his comments until after the discussion.

Michael Richmond thanked the Parks staff for all the work that had gone into the gym planning. He explained that the key issues before the group is whether some portion of the Jefferson ProParks funding should be used in conjunction with the gym project. He encouraged people who support that to express their support – either at this meeting or later. He also talked about how the community might express its support.

Report on Recent Meetings Don talked about the three recent meetings that had occurred since the last PAT meeting: the open house on 11/23/02, the community meeting immediately following the open house, and the follow-up community meeting on 12/14/02. The community meetings were sponsored by North Beacon Hill Council, Beacon Hill Chamber, and Community Center Advisory Council. He said that there was a lot of good productive discussion and that a lot of the thoughts expressed at those meetings have been incorporated into the scenarios that will be presented later in the meeting. Christopher Williams agreed that the meetings have been very helpful and pointed out that there was agreement at the community meetings that the key issues should be brought back to the PAT.

Project Scope/Funding Options Don explained that the issues have been distilled into two very different scenarios. He handed out a description of the scenarios. Don explained that one scenario is based on only using the funding that is available from the CCLP Levy. That funding totals \$2,463,000 total project amount – which provides \$1.5 million for construction contract amount. Don explained that the difference covers design, sales tax, project management and other similar costs. Don explained that that level of funding would result in a very simple design and that many of the project elements that people have expressed interest in could not be done.

Don then summarized the second scenario. That scenario is based on using about 300,000 to 350,000 of Jefferson Park 2000 ProParks funding to do site improvements that help implement the Jefferson Park site plan. Don explained that the ProParks Levy provided about \$8 million for Jefferson Park – some of it targeted toward specific projects but most of it is flexible and can be used for a wide range of improvements. He explained that there is a down side to using ProParks money now – and that is that spending money now will reduce funds available in the future to do other things that are very desirable

– notably construction of park improvements following SPU’s reservoir work. He also pointed out that the proposed amount is less than 5% of the flexible funding.

Don described the cost estimating process that ARC and Parks has been going through. He pointed out that a professional cost estimator is working on the numbers and that the estimate is very much a work in progress.

Don then walked the group through key items listed under the first scenario – when only CCLP funding is used. Under that scenario a full-size regulation gym would be constructed, with a flat roof, no clerestory windows, no windows/doors at the north wall, a lift (instead of a ramp), no exterior basketball court, no plaza on north side of gym, parking consistent with code requirements, and simple landscaping,

Greg asked for clarification on how that scenario relates to the graphics. Rex explained that under this scenario the gym would look similar to one of the options considered during the schematic design process. He pointed out that drawing – which was displayed on an easel.

Don then described the other scenario in which some ProParks funding would be used in conjunction with the gym project. Under that scenario he pointed out that the project would include most of the improvements that people have been requesting and would be consistent with the drawings prepared during the design development phase.

George asked how the items listed in this scenario were selected. Don replied that there are many elements of the building, under either scenario, that were not shown on the lists because they have not come up as issues in previous discussions. The items included on the list are those which have been brought up in previous discussion. Don also explained that there probably are wish list items that could have been included instead of some of the listed items, but what he tried to do is include the improvements that people have been expressing strong support for.

Liz asked how the design team is addressing the uncertainty of the cost of addressing the Seattle Public Utilities utility lines. Don replied that a “plug number” – a placeholder estimate – is being used until more refined numbers are available. Rex and Don said that over the next few weeks the number would be firmed up. George pointed out that none of the numbers will be certain until the project is built. Liz expressed concern that the project not be bid until these numbers are finalized. Don explained that bidding is several months away & that he would hand out a schedule later in the meeting. He summarized the

schedule: preparation of construction documents, building permit application, bidding, construction.

Don then returned to a discussion of the second scenario. He explained that this scenario would include a regulation size gym with a ramp, clerestory windows, windows at the north end of the gym, interior & exterior wall articulation, sloped roof, exterior basketball court, parking as required by DCLU, small plaza on north side of gym.

Don then talked briefly about relocation of the fence on the north side of the driving range. He said that the Parks Department is looking into that suggestion but that he strongly recommends against merging it with the gym project because that would significantly slow down the gym project. The fence would have to be 100 feet high. Robert reiterated that Seattle Golf spends up to \$50,000 per year on reimbursing people for broken car windows – so there is a financial benefit to replacing the fence as soon as possible.

The group then had some discussion about the scenarios. George suggested that Parks look into Robert's proposal. George also suggested using the basketball court for overflow parking during peak events. He also suggested consideration of building two basketball courts and no dedicated parking – the ideas would be that people would park in the Beacon medium except during peak event they would park on the basketball courts. He recognized that there would be DCLU issues.

Liz asked about the cost of the pitched roof. Don said approximately \$85,000. Liz asked about the cost of the clerestory windows. Rex said \$15,300.

Liz referred to the building space requirements shown in the design program. She said that she is reluctant to do the gym at 68 foot width. George asked what an additional 6 feet of width would be used for. Don explained that with a couple of exceptions, all of the Parks Department's gyms are 68 feet or less in width. Otis asked if there is enough room for bleachers in the 68-foot wide gym. Randy responded "yes" and explained how the gyms are set up.

Don handed out a list of all of the Parks Department's gyms showing width, length & area. He pointed out that many of the gyms are less than 68 feet wide. The recently built gyms are all 68 feet wide. Liz referred back to the design program and said that in the future the Parks Department should not say 74 feet if it means 68 feet. Don said they would try to avoid that mistake in the future. Ken explained that the program for 1999 CCLP projects was largely based on the 1991 Levy program.

Ken pointed out that the Lauehurst gym was left off the list and that it would be 68 feet or less in width. Liz then said that Parks should have asked for more money when the Levy was prepared and presented to voters. She said that the project should include expansion of community center lobby and replacement of space lost for internal circulation for the gym.

Don then talked about the building elements that would be done under the first and second scenarios listed as “minor elements”. These include the maple floor, wall pads at hoops, addressing SPU lines, landscaping, power backboards, gym monitor station, second door to storage room, misc. gym equipment, etc.

George asked about the benefit of power backboards. Otis said that the backboards are very heavy and the person cranking them has to be very strong. Randy agreed and said that it is a lot of work to crank them. It also takes some time to do it.

There was a little discussion about relocation of the reservoir fence. Don explained that SPU needs to approve relocation of the fence. Robert asked how close the fence is to the gym. Rex said he thought only a few feet and Don said he had heard more like 8 or 10 feet. The dimension depends on what SPU will allow. Don also pointed out that the fence will go away when SDPU does its reservoir work.

Greg asked why the Parks Department does not want to go with a larger gym size. Ken said that funding is a consideration but the bigger issues is consistency – that the Parks Department wants to maintain the same standard used throughout the system. George asked if there is a history of injuries that would indicate the wider gym should be built. Cheryl said Parks is not seeing claims. Ken said as a player and former coach he has not seen a pattern of problems. Randy said there are programming considerations. George said he would rather put the dollars into making the building more attractive and functional than widening the gym for a very small gain in space.

Betty Lau asked why the Parks Department gave funding to the International District-Chinatown Community Center for a gym. Ken explained the ID PDA applied for and got 250,000 from the ProParks opportunity fund. He described the process that was used in reaching that decision. Betty then said that Parks should be careful of relying on people who say they represent the community. She said notices should go out in various languages. Erin Devoto said that Parks often does do mailings in non-English languages.

Mike Carney asked whether the gym can be used for two half-court youth games at one time. Don replied “yes”. Mike went on to say that he thinks the amount of ProParks funding that would be used under the second scenario is not that much and has his support.

Recommendations on Funding & Project Scope

Don asked the group whether it supports using some of the ProParks funding in conjunction with the gym project. Ken added that if the Jefferson Gym PAT supports that approach then we will also want to take the issue to the Jefferson Site Planning PAT and to the ProParks Oversight Committee.

Robert spoke in favor of using ProParks funding in conjunction with the gym project. He said the proposed work is consistent with the intent of the ProParks Levy and with the Jefferson Site Plan.

Ed Hiro spoke about Seattle’s Olmsted Park system and that the Parks Department should make the necessary financial investment.

Kellye agreed with Ed.

Kevin asked whether the clerestory windows have been tested at the lighting La yet and whether it will cause glare. Rex responded that it has not been tested yet, but when it is a variety of different glazing material will be tested in an effort to eliminate glare potential.

George said that of all the things on the list the clerestory windows is what he would consider eliminating. He pointed out that the windows would not have a direct view of the sky. On the other hand he does like the effect it has on the exterior elevation – but he questions whether it is worth \$15,000.

Kellye said that needs to be something to break up the expanse of wall. Randy pointed out that there would have to be some wall expense if the windows were eliminated.

Don directed the group back to the key question – whether Parks should use some of the ProParks funding should be used in conjunction with the gym project. George said “yes”. Bill asked if the Jefferson ProParks funding is already allocated to other improvements. Don said “no”. Bill asked how firm the range of \$300,000 to 350,000 is. Ken said this is an estimate based on the information we have at this time. He pointed out that we will not know the numbers for certain until we bid the project. Ken also said that it may be that as the numbers firm up we find that we need to drop some proposed improvements off the list. Bill asked whether the group should be asking for \$500,000. Erin pointed out that there are significant

uncertainties ahead for the park work associated with the reservoir reconstruction and that people are going to want more money. Christopher clarified that the gym monitor is intended to be a person who monitors the activity of young people using the gym.

Don said that his impression is that most people who are present support using ProParks funds. He asked if anyone does not support using it. There were no objections. He then asked the group what dollar amount they felt comfortable with.

George said that he feels that the site improvements – improvements outside the building itself – are a legitimate ProParks expenditure. He asked what the dollar amount of the site improvements are. Don replied that it is approximately \$300,000 to \$350,000. Erin emphasized that the numbers at this point are just estimates that they could change. George said he supports that amount of funding and he would like Parks to take a look at the driving range fence idea.

Jean said she supports using the ProParks funding for doing an attractive building. Kelly said she agrees.

Kevin asked what we would be giving up in the future. Don said there is no way to answer that since the funding has not been allocated at this time. Ken pointed out that the SPU project will be very large and no there is no doubt we will wish we had more parks money to make improvements, but at the same time the SPU project will offer many opportunities for moving forward with implementation of the park master plan.

Don reiterated that the group has expressed support for using ProParks funding, that it is comfortable with using up to 350,000, and that there is interest in exploring the driving range fence idea.

Liz added that the designers should look at enlarging the gym entry lobby. There was a brief discussion about the clerestory windows and Rex said they could be included in the bid package as an alternate.

Liz said that there is a letter from Mike Richmond pertaining to the gym project and she is interested in having Parks respond to it.

Project Schedule & Upcoming Tasks

Don handed out copies of the current schedule. Don said he will try to hold a meeting of the Jefferson Site Plan PAT in mid-January – prior to the next Gym PAT meeting. Ken reiterated that he want the Site Planning PAT to have an opportunity to review the proposed use of ProParks funds and then he wants to run it past the ProParks Oversight Committee.

Michael Richmond passed around a letter stating support for use of ProParks funds - to Ken - for people to sign. Michael thanked everyone and said it was a terrific meeting.

Wrap-up & Good Night

Don thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.

Next Meeting:

The next PAT meeting is scheduled for 7 pm, Thursday, January 30, 2003, Jefferson Community Center.

Minutes Recorded By:

Don Bullard